Serial No. 10/564,174 Docket No. 024783.027 Page 4

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to recite " ... the small points forming perforations in the semi-belts, thereby ... ". Support for this amendment is found in US 2006/0167433 page 2, paragraph [0034] and [0035] and FIGS. 2 and 8. Also, -- lamination rolls – has been substituted for "the layers" to provide an antecedent basis.

In response to the Office Action of June 14, 2007, the applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The applicant pointed out that claim 1 had been amended to recite a series of projections formed on at least one of the lamination rolls, creating a punctiform union between the layers. In the Office Action, the Examiner states that "Gipson discloses the belt has small projections, which form a union between the left and right belts (column 4, lines 3-8)". It is submitted that Gipson actually discloses a hook and loop type fastening system (such as "Velcro"). This is supported by column 4, lines 12-23 which states:

"Hook type material and receiving material are considered 'complementary' if the opening between the strands or fibers are sized to allow at least one engaging means of the hook type material to penetrate into the surface of the receiving material and to be engaged or intercepted thereby."

This hook type material is clearly distinguishable from the points forming perforating in the semi-belts claimed by the applicant. The small points actually penetrate the semi-belt as show in FIG. 8 and discussed in paragraph [0035] of the publication US 2006/0167433.

The cited reference does not in any manner suggest nor disclose the points forming perforations in the semi-belt. The reference refers to "fibers" to engage the hook type material. The applicant's device has no such fibers. Neither does the applicant suggest nor disclose a "hook".

Rather the applicant claims "small points", not "hooks".

Serial No. 10/564,174

Page 5

Docket No. 024783.027

It is submitted that claim 1, as amended, has a different structure from the cited reference and the reference does not disclose each element of the claimed invention. Accordingly, lifting of this basis of rejection and allowance of amended claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5, which have not been further amended, are no longer dependent on a rejected claim and allowance of claims 2-5 is respectfully requested.

It appears that all matters have been addressed satisfactorily, and that the case is now in condition for a complete allowance; and the same is respectfully urged.

However, if the Examiner has any comments or questions, or has any suggestions as per MPEP 707.07 (d) and (j), for putting the case in condition for final allowance, he is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned attorney-of-record at the telephone number below, so that an expeditious resolution may be effected and the case passed to issue promptly.

Respectfully submitted,

Sep 11, 2007

Robert M. Gamson

Reg. No. 32,986

Attorney for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMITTAL

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450,

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

September 11, 2007

Express Mail No. EB256019374US

Carolyn H. Bates

HODES, PESSIN & KATZ, P.A. 901 Dulaney Valley Road, Suite 400 Towson, MD 21204

Phone:

410-769-6145

Fax:

410-832-5637

E-Mail:

rgamson@hpklegal.com

RMG/chb

G:\files\GAMSON\D'ALCINI (Baldi)\024783.027\PTO amendment.docx